

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FII | LING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/993,080 | 11/13/2001 | | Jerome P. Ranch | 0881 | 6034 |
| 27310 | 7590 | 11/02/2004 | | EXAM | INER |
| PIONEER | HI-BRED | INTERNATION | KALLIS, RUSSELL | | |
| 7100 N.W. 62ND AVENUE P.O. BOX 1000 | | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| JOHNSTON, IA 50131 | | | | 1638 | |

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/993,080 | RANCH ET AL. |
| Auvisory Action | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Russell Kallis | 1638 |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address |
| THE REPLY FILED 29 September 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | oid abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment which | ation. A proper reply to a places the application in |
| PERIOD FOR RE | PLY [check either a) or b)] | |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply contact than three months after the mail | g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF | | |
| 2. $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $ | ecause: | |
| (a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (s | see NOTE below); |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b | elow); | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mate | rially reducing or simplifying the |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceli | ng a corresponding number of fi | nally rejected claims. |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | ion(s): | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a se | parate, timely filed amendment |
| 5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See | | dered but does NOT place the |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY to | o issues which were newly |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,4-6,12,13,25-30,36,37,49</u> and <u>9</u> | 53-61. | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 3,7-10,14-2 | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr | | ne Examiner. |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer | | |
| 10. Other: | / // - / - / - / - / - / - / - / - / - | |
| <u>.</u> | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No. 009/993,080

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amenment of claims 1, 25, 49 and 55 to the introduction of a nucleic acid within 6 hours of isolating an immature maize embryo would require further consideration and search.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is maintained for reasons of record. Applicants arguments that stably transformed plants were only obtained in experiments where the immature embryos were bombarded a day or more after isolation does not address the Examiners remark that Applicant has not distinguished how their invention is different over that taught in the art. Applicant's remarks suggest that the presence of stably transformed plants somehow obviates the anticipatory method steps taught by Dunder, i.e. bombardment on the day of embryo excision; and the obviousness of optimizing method steps i.e. the timing of introducing the nucleotide construct following excision and holding the immature embryos on auxin-depleted before transformation. Clearly all the materials and procedural guidance of the claimed invention has already been set forth in the prior art.

AMY J. NELSON, PH.D SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Any Mel